DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 111 PS 020 693

AUTHOR Dorr-Bremme, Donald W.
TITLE Discourse and Social Identity in a Kindergarten-First Grade Classroom.
PUB DATE 23 Apr 92
NOTE 66p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Grade 1; Group Dynamics; Interpersonal Communication; Kindergarten; *Peer Influence; Primary Education; *Self Concept; Social Development; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Influence; *Teacher Student Relationship; Verbal Development; *Young Children
IDENTIFIERS *First Circles; *Social Identify

ABSTRACT

In this study of students in a combined kindergarten-first grade class, the impact of students' ways of speaking on their classroom social identities was considered. The study focused on discourse in "first circle," a daily event in which teacher and students meet to start school by taking attendance, filling in a calendar, and planning the day's activities. Researchers videotaped and transcribed seven first circles at roughly comparable points across two successive school years. Videotape viewing sessions and interviews were subsequently held with the teacher. The teacher found several dimensions of social identity important, including: academic capability or advancement; maturity; talkativeness; independence; aggressiveness; ability to follow through; and leadership. Her responses to students seemed to depend on how she viewed them both as students and as circle participants. The study concluded that each student's social identity was the conjoint product of everyone's interaction in the classroom scene, rather than a construct between student and teacher. Identities were constructed through a social process in which students' discourse performances and ways of speaking, local exigencies of the speech situation, context-specific discourse rules, and the teacher's interpretative schemes were mutually interdependent. (Contains 51 references, 11 data tables, and 7 examples of dialogue.) (AC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED352711

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

DISCOURSE AND SOCIAL IDENTITY IN A KINDERGARTEN - FIRST GRADE CLASSROOM

DONALD W. DORR-BREMME
Education Department
Whittier College

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA (April 23, 1992)

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Donald W. Dorr-Bremme
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

--DRAFT--
PLEASE DO NOT DUPLICATE OR
CITE WITHOUT THE AUTHOR'S PERMISSION
--DRAFT--

PS 020693

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This paper explores the process through which students' ways of speaking in classrooms become consequential for their classroom social identities. Recent reviews of research on classroom discourse indicate that this is largely uncharted ground (Cazden, 1986, 1988).

The research reported focuses on discourse in "first circle," a daily event in a combined kindergarten and first grade class in a working class suburb of Boston. Studied in detail across two successive school years, first circle is a commonly occurring type of event in American primary classrooms, one in which teacher and students meet to start school by taking attendance, filling in a calendar, planning the day's activities, and sometimes sharing personal experiences that they have had outside the classroom.

During certain moments in first circle, the teacher demonstrably takes into account "who" children are as kinds of students and circle participants. She locates evidence for her interpretations of students' identities in the talk that they do, and she responds differentially to students based on these interpretations.

On first consideration, it appears that each student's social identity is constructed between teacher and student. Closer examination, however, suggests that individual students' social identities are *the conjoint product of everyone's interaction in the classroom scene*: that they are constructed through a social process in which each student's discourse performances, other students' ways of speaking, local exigencies of the speech situation, context-specific discourse rules, and the teacher's interpretative schemes are mutually interdependent.

SOCIAL IDENTITY

Sociologists have frequently defined social identity in terms of the positions, or statuses, within a given society. People occupy these social positions based upon certain individual attributes. Some of the relevant

attributes are give directly by birth, for example, gender, skin color, ethnicity, and some physical abilities. Others are given indirectly at birth, such as language and dialect, religious affiliation, and initial social class rank. Still others are attained by individuals through their own efforts: school grades and test scores, job performance evaluations, experience with particular technical skills and tools, and so forth. In any case, such attributes, alone or in combination, directly determine a person's status or social identity. Institutionalized role expectations, or rights and duties, are attached to each status and guide the actions of individuals who occupy it vis-a-vis those in other statuses (Goffman 1959; Linton 1936; Parsons 1968; Parsons & Shils, 1951).

Viewed from this perspective, one's identity within a group is a "social fact" (Durkheim 1896). The statuses that define people simply exist "out there" in the world. They are consensually accepted parts of the society's institutions, external to actions and interactions of individual group members, the creations of no one in particular (Cicourel 1974: 29ff). Social identities are given in the institutional setting or social situation and function to constrain people's behavior. Individuals merely play out the roles expected of anyone who occupies their particular social position. All this is evident in Davis's (1948: 86ff.) classic discussion of status:

> A person therefore enters a social situation with an identity already established. His identity refers to his position, or status, within the social structure applicable to the given situation, and establishes his rights and obligations with reference to others holding positions within the same structure. . . To aid in establishing the identity of the person, external symbols are frequently utilized. A common indicator, for example, is style of dress.

This perspective has explicitly or implicitly shaped much research not only in sociology but also in anthropology (e.g., Spradley 1972; Spradley & McCurdy 1974) and in education (e.g., Good & Brophy 1986). It has become widely familiar,

shaping folk conceptions of social identity. It is, however, rejected here as inadequate.

Social science research generally purports to describe and explain how *members of the group under study* routinely organize their daily lives and accomplish everyday events. Given that goal, description and interpretation are valid only to the extent that they take into account and clarify the terms and meanings known to and used participants in the activities under study as they engage in those activities (Erickson 1979; Hymes 1982; Mehan 1982). As Cicourel (1974) has argued, however, there is little evidence that "status" and "role" are relevant terms for people in everyday life: that people in fact use them in defining situations, assigning meaning to events, or ordering their daily affairs. Instead, evidence suggests that people take into account and act upon situational social identities that they construct and interpret from moment to moment in the course of everyday interaction (e.g., Cicourel 1968; Erickson & Shultz 1982; Sudnow 1965). Studies indicate that even such seemingly constant parameters of social identity as gender, ethnicity, and social class are constructed, interpreted, and manipulated during interaction (e.g., Blom & Gumperz 1972; Garfinkel 1967: 116-185; Gumperz 1982; Moerman 1988).

From this perspective,

> Social identity can be thought of as a package with diverse contents. . . . A student, for example, may possess all of the following attributes: He may be well dressed, be Italian-American, be of a working class family background, be an older brother, work part-time as a cook in a restaurant, have a 3.8 grade point average on a 4-point scale, be a male, look physically fit and active, play left end on the school football team, be enrolled in a data-processing program. . . .
> These attributes differ dimensionally in kind. Which subset of attributes and which dimensions will become salient [in any particular social encounter] depends upon the exigencies of the local production of interaction in that particular encounter. . . . Participants in an encounter can be thought of as being able to move attributes of social identity back and forth across the

> attentional frame boundary. Considering the hypothetical student again, one can see that at any point in an encounter only some of his many attributes of status will be attended to as relevant by [the person with whom he is interacting] (Erickson & Shultz 1982: 13-15).

The shifting of the "attentional frame," and with it salient features of social identity, occurs constantly in interaction. As people interact, they perpetually scan the scene, taking into account countless perceptual "data" about the time and place, objects in the setting, and especially the actions of others present (Erickson & Shultz 1981; McDermott 1976). These data emerge constantly with everyone's behavior in the evolving social scene; and everyone in the scene constantly articulates the emerging data with societal norms, rules, or standards in order to assign meaning to them (cf. Cicourel 1974:29; Garfinkel 1967; Goodenough 1964, 1981; Gumperz 1972; Hymes 1974; Spradley 1972). In so doing, each participant continually interprets "who we are and what we are doing now" (Cicourel 1974). They make sense, that is, of one another's social identities at the moment and of the nature of the activity at hand.

Participants' interpretations of "who we are" and of "what we are doing now" are interdependent. Each participant's sense of the current activity, i.e., of everyone's present social purposes, contributes to his or her interpretation of who people are by focusing attention and interpretation upon some of their attributes and behaviors and away from others. As interpretations of the activity and of the purposes of interaction evolve with everyone's moment to moment actions, what is noticed and what is left unnoticed can change. Aspects of participants' attributes and behavior that were disregarded as irrelevant at one moment may become the focus of attention at another a few seconds later. Reciprocally, each participants' sense of everyone's social identity at the moment contributes to his or her interpretation of the present activity by focusing attention on some meanings or purposes that can be plausibly assigned to their actions and away from others. (cf. Erickson & Shultz, 1982: 14-15; Goffman 1974.)

Together, each participant's interpretations of "who we are and what we are doing now" constitute a definition of the social situation which serves to circumscribe the set of alternatives from which participants draw in determining how to act at the moment (cf. Bateson 1972; Erickson & Shultz 1981; Gumperz 1982: 130ff.; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz 1982: 17-19). Thus, each party in interaction continuously interprets the evolving scene in which he or she is acting and continuously acts in the scene based on his or her interpretations of it (cf. Dorr-Bremme 1985: 71-72; Mehan 1982: 63-65). As they do, they socially assemble that scene. In the process of assembling it, participants' social identities are recurrently, collaboratively reconstructed and reinterpreted, negotiated and renegotiated, through all participants' moment to moment actions and interpretations.

Normative notions of status and role are parts of the general "background understandings" that people use in assigning meaning to phenomena in the interactional scene and interpreting the scene as it evolves (Cicourel, 1974: 29. For an example, see Mehan 1981). However, it is persons' situational social identities -- interpretations by one party in interaction of "who" another is at a given moment-- that are most relevant to actors in everyday interactional scenes. These identities influence the actions that people take toward one another.

Discourse is a principal arena in which social identity is negotiated. In reaching interpretations about "who we are" in the course of interaction, participants can attend to many features of one another's discourse, for instance, voice tone and pitch, speech tempo and rhythm, linguistic code and dialect, and speech register or style, as well as the referential meanings of words. They can also attend to such nonverbal features of the scene as people's physical appearance, postures, gaze directions, facial expressions, and interpersonal distancing (Birdwhistell 1970; Erickson 1976; Erickson & Shultz 1982; Gumperz

1976, 1982; Hymes 1974; Kendon 1977; McDermott 1976; Scheflen 1973, 1974; Shultz & Florio 1979)

In summary, "who" a person is to others can shift from moment to moment as social interaction unfolds, depending upon participants' interpretations of what is going on at the moment, what the purposes of the interaction are, and (thus) which dimensions of social identity deserve attentional focus.

METHODS

Researchers videotaped seven instances of first circle at roughly comparable points across the two successive school years studied. Of these 14, I analyzed 8 instances in detail: 5 from the first year (hereafter, Year 1) and 3 from the second (Year 2), totaling 2 hours, 17 minutes, and 13 seconds of circle interaction.

Analysis of circle interaction followed procedures outlined by Erickson and Shultz (1981), McDermott (1976), Mehan (1979), and Scheflen (1973). In particular, the utterances of the teacher and students were fully transcribed in real time, such that each transcript line recorded the teacher talk and student talk uttered during one second of interaction as measured by a date-time-generator clock that displayed running time on the video screen in minutes, seconds, and tenths of seconds. The beginnings and endings of participants' utterances were marked in relation to each other; the durations of pauses within utterances and of silence between speakers were added. Repeated viewing of the videotapes led to low-inference notation of other features of interaction that seemed to be routinely organized and functionally relevant to circle's accomplishment. Only those specifically mentioned here, however, are relevant to this account.

To check and confirm the results of the fine-grained analysis, I repeatedly reviewed the remaining six first circle videotapes and examined observational notes taken during still other first circles.

Videotape viewing sessions and interviews with the teacher were conducted to gather information about her goals, her perceptions of circle interactions , and especially her interpretations of her students.

Five video viewing sessions were held during each school year. In addition, one was conducted in November and another in January of the school year following the completion of videotaping. Elicitations and discussion during the viewing sessions were open-ended. Usually, the researchers asked the teachers to watch strips of videotape and to stop it and comment when she noticed something "interesting" or "unusual" or "typical," depending upon the concerns of the session.

Frequently during these sessions, the teacher's spontaneous remarks centered on her students and their characteristics. I tabulated the descriptors that she volunteered during these sessions in order to determine which recurred most frequently. I explored relationships between and among these descriptors in interviews. In addition, during a general interview at the end of each school year, I gave the teacher a set of cards with a class member's name on each and asked the teacher to lay them out in any pattern that she wanted" "in order to show how you think of the students" along one of the dimensions that had frequently recurred in her viewing session comments. A separate display was requested for each dimension, and intersections among the different displays were explored. All of the viewing sessions and interviews were recorded on audiotape.

These data were augmented by field notes documenting classroom observations and informal conversations with the teacher, as well as by some unofficial classroom records that the teacher allowed to be copied.

SOCIAL IDENTITY IN MS. WRIGHT'S CLASSROOM

The classroom teacher, Ms. Wright[1], displayed considerable knowledge of her students. She knew details about their parents, siblings, and home lives; about their neighborhoods, friendships, and interests. Her talk and writing about

students, however, recurrently focused upon a finite number of attributes: dimensions of social identity that she seemed to find especially important. These are summarized below.

PRINCIPLE DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL IDENTITY

Academic capability or advancement. Ms. Wright talked often and in considerable detail about students' "capabilities," "levels," "advancement," or "progress" in reading, math, writing, and other curricular areas. She spoke in differentiated ways of individual's attainments in each of these areas, describing, for example, how many of the capital and lower-case letter students could recognize, their levels of reading comprehension, and their performance on word problems in math. More generally, she identified some students as "the most advanced academically," others as "very advanced," still others as "average" or "at grade level," and some as "not as advanced" or as "slow."

Maturity. Maturity for Ms. Wright was synonymous with "with-it-ness" or "school-wise-ness." Mature, with-it students, she explained, know or figure out quickly what is going on and what they are supposed to be doing. One or two explanations of procedures suffice for them. They "listen and think," or "eventually catch on just when they see what everyone else is doing." In contrast, students who are "immature" or "out of it," she indicated, need "individual instructions or invitations, to be told how to do something again and again." They often "get off the track we're on" and "speak out inappropriately."

Talkativeness, verbalness, expressiveness, communicativeness. Ms. Wright used these terms interchangeably to describe how much students "talk out" or "speak up" to her and to other children, especially in group situations. This was a matter with which she repeatedly voiced considerable concern, indicating that in general she valued greater talkativeness.

Independence. Independent students, according to Ms. Wright, are able to pursue activities on their own without "lots of direction from an adult." They

have "self-confidence." Dependent students, by contrast, routinely "seek lots of direction and reassurance" from adults; they "need constant praise." Her comments suggested that independence and maturity were separable but that lack of independence was "often a sign of immaturity."

Aggressiveness. Aggressive students, from the teacher's perspective, "aren't aggressive in a mean sort of way"; rather "they go after what they want and do it and have success with it." "Passive" students, on the other hand "hang back" or "wait for an invitation" to play or work with others when they should simply "go up and join in." In some instances, they allow classmates "to push them aside." Ms. Wright indicated that students could be independent of adults but "not aggressive" with peers.

Ability to follow through. To "follow through," for Ms. Wright, was "to initiate an activity, stay with it for a longer span, have a higher interest, and finish it." A student who lacks this the ability to follow through "just jumps from thing to thing," "leaves something and goes on to something else," or "doesn't sustain an interest."

Leadership: reliable or unreliable. Ms. Wright spoke of some students in her classes as "leaders" or "organizers." These were, she said, "people that the other children will tend to follow"; "the others know who they are and will take their lead from them" or "will imitate" them. While she used "reliable" or "unreliable" more generally, she most often applied these terms to leaders or organizers. "Reliable" leaders were "predictable" as consistently good role models. Those who were "unreliable" or "unpredictable" were often "strong willed" or persistent in doing "whatever it is they want."

Ms. Wright described both class groups and individual students primarily in terms of these dimensions.

IDENTITIES OF THE YEAR 1 AND YEAR 2 CLASSES

Ms. Wright viewed her Year 1 and Year 2 classes as having somewhat different group identities. She saw the Year 1 class overall as more able academically than the class in Year 2, although Year 1 kindergarteners were as a group "more immature, and/or less experienced, school wise children" than others with whom she had worked. These kindergarteners, she said, were "coupled with some independent, confident, capable first graders." From Ms. Wright's viewpoint, too, the group in Year 1 was on the whole more talkative than the group in Year 2.

By contrast, descriptors such as "less expressive," "non-communicative," "little communication with me,or other children," and "very quiet" recurred in her remarks about individual Year 2 students. The six children that she labeled the "quietest" in her Year 1 class, all kindergarteners, continued on in her class as first graders in Year 2. They comprised one half of the first-grade group that year.

Ms. Wright judged that her Year 2 class had "fewer academic standouts" and fewer "creative, spontaneous children" than had been in the Year 1 class. "Test scores were more grade level" in Year 2, she reported. She saw the Year 2 class as having a more mature kindergarten contingent but "fewer leaders." Especially among the first graders, the "more mature and academically capable students" tended to be "quiet" and "to hold back."

CLASSROOM IDENTITIES OF SALIENT STUDENTS

Within these two classes, certain individual students were particularly salient for Ms. Wright. She noticed and volunteered remarks about these children more frequently than others during viewing sessions, interviews, and her informal conversations with researchers. She spoke with them frequently during first circle. As she explained, "You get to know either the very very good or very very bright,the very very verbal, or the very very slow and very very withdrawn, but there are a lot middle people that I think you have to seek out or make time for."

In Year 1 six of her ten first graders stood out for Ms. Wright as students who performed especially well both academically and socially. She described all six -- Rico, Dee, Katie, Elaine, Susan, and Laura-- as "academically quite advanced." She cited them as mature and independent children who usually managed to follow through with the projects that they undertook. She said that they made their presence felt in a variety of ways, especially by "speaking out in group times" such as first circle. Ms. Wright called them "leaders" of the Year 1 class and added, "They're good, reliable kids."

Two Year 1 kindergarteners, Billy and Daniel, and another first grader, Alice, were also noteworthy for Ms. Wright. Throughout Year 1, she spoke consistently of all three as "very immature." She noted that, while "they will speak up, they're not shy," they nevertheless "are the three that tend to make inappropriate remarks for the content going on at the time." Ms. Wright considered them three of the four academically "slowest" students in the class.

Similarly, certain Year 2 class members recurrently captured Ms. Wright attention. In particular, four stood out for her as especially talkative in the generally "very quiet" Year 2 class. Two, Arthur and Louise, were first graders; the two others, Louie and Wanetta, were kindergarteners. She referred to all four as "students who tend to take over a lot of the conversations" and explained that they often "just go off on tangents."

Ms. Wright saw Louise as "quite immature," and she frequently questioned the maturity of the others. Wanetta, she said, "doesn't always get with what's going on and she can be very insistent, demands whatever it is she wants, very immature." She observed that "Arthur is a leader" but also noted that "he is very strong-willed. He'll act out, tantrum really." (At the end of Year 2, she commented that "he has gotten much more control.") "Louie can be an organizer, [but] sometimes he seems so out of it." "just goes off on his own thing lots of times." All in all, the most salient characteristic of all four for Ms. Wright was a

persistent "talkativeness" that often took classroom conversations off track. None of the four, she stated explicitly , was "consistently reliable." None was listed among the few Year 2 academic "stand outs," although she noted that Arth[illegible] was "quite good" in math.

These four students seemed to dominate Ms. Wright's attention throughout Year 2. She spoke of other individuals in the group nowhere near as frequently. When she did talk of others, it was usually to mention how quiet they were.

The foregoing has provided an overview of (a) the dimensions of social identity which most concerned Ms. Wright as a kindergarten and first grade teacher, (b) how she perceived the collective identities of the two classes studied along these dimensions, and (c) how she applied these dimensions in describing the general classroom identities of certain salient Year 1 and Year 2 students. These students will be focal in subsequent analyses.

With this information as background, I now turn to the two central issues of the paper: (1) how students' social identities are constructed interactionally in the course of first circle, and (2) how,certain dimensions of these identities become situationally relevant during the this event.

Discussion of these issues begins with examination of the social demands upon participants in first circle and the interactional "rules" through which participants meet those demands. Beginning with these matters is appropriate in view of theoretical points made at the outset of this paper. One would expect that certain dimensions of students' identities become salient during circle for the teacher in light of "the exigencies of the local production of interaction" in circle (cf. Erickson & Shultz 1982: 13). In addition, one would assume that, in order to locate and interpret these dimensions, the teacher articulates general circle rules or procedures with emergent student actions in circle (cf. Cicourel 1974: 29).

THE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF FIRST CIRCLE

First circle routinely marks the start of the school day in Ms. Wright's class. A 15- or 20-minute event, it serves as a time when the teacher and students prepare for later morning activities.

EXIGENCIES

Ms. Wright says that first circle's purposes are "organizing," "teaching," and "sharing." The first two, she elaborates, are essential to the smooth flow of the class events that follow. Sharing, or talking about students' experiences outside school, also helps get the day off to a good start: "The rug is soft and kind of intimate, and so much of the morning is segmented, this is one time together that we function as a group."

Ms. Wright considers first circle a key event in the daily routine, and she recurrently manifests two concerns about how circle "goes." First, she wants to see the work of circle completed promptly. Ms. Wright finds the duration of subsequent morning events less easy to manage than the duration of circle. Finishing circle promptly allows flexibility in the schedule later on. The students' behavior suggests that they share this concern, albeit for different reasons. While many participate avidly in circle, the group generally becomes restless if circle extends beyond its usual duration. In such cases, the class begins shifting about, and some children can be heard to ask in impatient tones, "Can we go work now?" They want to move on to *work time*, the period of instructional play that follows first circle each morning.

Second, Ms. Wright wants the circle to be conducted in a "friendly" manner. Being friendly in circle, she explains, means hearing what individual students have to say "without always criticizing them," "putting them down," or "cutting them off." More generally, Ms. Wright explains that she wants to "hear from many different students" during the morning, and "circle is one main time for doing that." For their part, students manifest a desire to be heard and especially to

"share" with the class. When it is time for sharing and even during momentary lulls in circle, students routinely try to capture Ms. Wright's attention for turns to speak about personal experiences.

First circle is constructed each day with no particular planning on the part of the teacher. As Ms. Wright explains six months after the end of Year 2:

> It was a constant thing. . . .[But] I would never sit down the night before and write a lesson plan for circle. I mean, I never plan this is what we're going to do and this is who I'm going to call on and this is what I'm going to say. They are spontaneous on my part.

None of the organizational structures or procedures described below was ever articulated to the students during any circle videotaped or observed. She mentioned none of them to the researchers explicitly as structures, segments or routines, procedures or rules. All were tacit features of first circle's organization, socially constructed in interaction by the teacher and students together.[2]

SPEECH ACTIVITIES

From one day to another, the teacher and class routinely interact such that they recurrently organize their first circle talk into one or another of seven different activities accomplished through speaking. These recurrent speech activity segments constitute main organizational features of first circle.

> The best way of characterizing what I mean by "speech activity" is to name some, using descriptive phrases such as "discussing politics," "chatting about the weather," "trying to catch someone's attention," and "lecturing about linguistics." Such descriptions imply certain expectations about thematic progression, turn-taking rules, form, and outcome of interaction, as well as constraints upon content . . . . (Gumperz 1977: 206)

As the brief descriptions below attempt to convey, the seven types of circle speech activity do in fact entail different thematic progressions, constraints upon content, and outcomes of interaction. They also entail some partially different

turn-taking rules. And, as I shall demonstrate shortly, expectations about these features of discourse provide a basis for interpreting students' situation-specific social identities.

Ms. Wright construes the talk done in the first five speech activities listed as "organizing." She speaks of the talk done in the sixth as "teaching" and in the seventh as "sharing."

1. *Greetings and noticings.* In this segment the teacher greets the students and, occasionally, notices and briefly remarks on such matters as the weather, students' appearance, or things that have taken place just before circle. Rarely, something she notices leads to her narrating a related story or experience. Students return her greetings and elaborate upon her noticings in brief turns.

2. *Reviewing morning activities.* The teacher describes activities that will take place later in the morning and explains the procedures for activities that occur infrequently. The students join in with elaborative remarks and questions. Much of the talk center on *work time*, the event which routinely follows circle and consists of small-group and individual instructional play alternatives in classroom "centers" and "corners."

3. *Distributing students to work time activities.* During this segment, the teacher selects students for certain work time activities in which participation must be limited, for example, the paints (only two easels); the big blocks (space for only four children); and the day's special teacher-led project (finite resources). She mentions available choices, elicits volunteers, and names the students chosen for each. Students indicate interest by raising a hand or calling out.

4. *Doing the calendar.* A student is chosen to fill in the day's date on a large wall calendar. The teacher directs the student as necessary and often questions the class about days of the week, the length of time until a given

holiday, and so forth. Class members answer, sometimes adding relevant information on days and dates.

5. *Seeing who is absent.* Teacher and students scan the group, and some call out the names of absent classmates. From time to time, the group counts members in chorus in order to determine if all absentees have been identified.

6. *Teaching about morning activities.* First circle is not a time for formal, curricular instruction, but Ms. Wright occasionally teaches skills or concepts that students will need for the day's activities: how to paste, on a day when they will make a collage; about feet and inches, on a day when they will visit the nurse and be measured. Teaching is evident in the teacher's informatives and especially in the teacher elicitation - student response - teacher evaluation sequence which Mehan (1979) and others have found typical of classroom lessons.

7. *Sharing personal things.* Sharing unfolds as the teacher recognizes individual students who bid for turns by raising a hand or calling her name. Recognized students take the floor one after another for a long speaking turn or a long series of turns with Ms. Wright, telling the group about what the teacher calls "personal things": events and activities in their lives outside school, such as a vacation, a birthday party, or a day at the park. Ms. Wright never shares. She sometimes elicits further information about the student's topic and often underscores and "appreciates" the point of the child's narrative.

Over the eight instances of circle studied in detail, the group spends 88 percent of its time in one or another of the seven speech activities just described. No others were observed to occur in the circles of either school year. But while the group is on the rug for first circle, interaction sometimes occurs that does not constitute any of these regular circle activities.

Some of this interaction takes shape as a "time out" in circle. Messengers arrive with papers for Ms. Wright; announcements for school staff come over the public address system; the teacher momentarily leaves the circle area to get

something that she wants to show the class. During such moments, the regular circle discourse is briefly suspended.

In addition, there are recurrent occasions in circle when things go momentarily awry. Some students call out, vying for the teacher's attention to share personal things. Others turn to converse with classmates nearby. Ms. Wright strives to restore an organizing or "teaching" segment. None of the concerted patterns of discourse constituting first circle speech activities is evident.

The seven listed segments of speech activity comprise contexts for circle discourse. They are socially constituted environments, constructed of participants' understandings of what is going on and of the decisions that participants take on the basis of those understandings (Dorr-Bremme 1990; Erickson & Shultz 1981; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz 1982: 17ff.) Circle participants, however, do not necessarily construct all seven of these contexts for speaking every day or in the same order from one day to another.

Only two of the listed segments appear daily: *reviewing morning activities* and *distributing students to work time activities*. Ms. Wright identifies these as circle's "main organizing segments." The other five are optional features of first circle. They are included or omitted as circumstances (particularly the amount of time available) seem to warrant.

Further, the sequence in which these seven can occur is only partially ordered. *Greetings and noticings* regularly comes first when it appears. *Distributing students to work time activities* always comes last. The others unfold in no regular sequence (see examples in Table 1.)

Thus, as Erickson & Shultz (1981:148) have observed of contexts in general, in first circle, "These interactionally constituted environments are embedded in time and can change from moment to moment. With each context change, the role relationships among participants are redistributed to produce differing

configurations of concerted action . . . ." The next section describes the configurations of concerted action that appear in the discourse through which the contexts speaking summarized above are accomplished.

PROCEDURES FOR TURN TAKING AND SPEAKING

Together, the teacher and students collectively assemble certain systematic procedures for conducting their circle discourse. These routine procedures vary consistently with the circle context or speech activity. One set applies in organizing and teaching segments, i.e., in the first six speech activities listed above; another set applies during sharing. Space considerations preclude comprehensive description, illustration, and documentation of these procedures here.[3] The following, however, will suffice for development of this account.

Organizing And Teaching Segments. During circle's organizing and teaching activities, Ms. Wright informs, explains, and elicits information from students. In so doing, she initiates topics of discourse. It is never appropriate for students to do so during these activities.

In order to get turns at speaking as Ms. Wright speaks during organizing and teaching segments, and to do so such that what they say is acknowledged by the teacher with something other than a reprimand, students needs to follow the following procedures (written here as rules).

> (1) When the teacher is informing, explaining, or otherwise speaking in ways that are not interpretable as elicitations, speak up directly and "claim" the floor with an utterance that either (a) elaborates the topic the teacher is currently addressing or (b) repairs, or calls explicitly or implicitly for the repair, of that topic.

While students sometimes bid for the teacher's recognition by calling her name or raising a hand, these bids are never are never recognized in Year 1 organizing and teaching segments, and they are recognized but rarely during those segments in Year 2 (Table 2).

But in order to get an acknowledged turn at speaking, students must do more than simply speak up with some utterance that is not a bid. Their utterance must be accessible to the teacher[4] and must address the teacher's current discourse topic: a point or idea--technically, the grammatical subject of a proposition--which is sustained by Ms. Wright across more than one sentence and/or by her and student speakers across more than one speaking turn (Keenan & Schieffelin 1976). Furthermore, students must address that topic in such a way that they "take it somewhere" or "do something with it."

Topic collaborating utterances[5] do neither of these things. They match exactly the topic in the teacher's previous conversational turn, joining in on or implicitly agreeing to it. Examples include students' repetitions of Ms. Wright's words or phrases, as well as statements such as "I have one of those too," "I was wondering about that," "I know," and so forth. Such utterances are sometimes pursued in dyadic, adult-child interactions. Ms. Wright sometimes uses them to extend exchanges with students in other classroom situations, but she never acknowledges them in any way during circle. They contribute minimally to the organizing or teaching task at hand and could, if pursued, detract from it.

Student utterances that elaborate Ms. Wright's discourse topic or contribute to its repair, however, contribute to circle's accomplishment. Topic elaborating utterances take some presupposition of the immediately preceding discourse topic and add to it, developing it. Those that repair the topic correct some presupposition or assumption explicit or implicit in the preceding utterance, helping to sustain the discourse. Utterances that call implicitly or explicitly for discourse-topic repair do so by making Ms. Wright aware that some piece of information that her topic presupposes an understanding of is not understood by everyone in the class. (For example, as Ms. Wright is explaining that the class will shellac cookie-dough Christmas ornaments, Katie asks, "What's that [shellac] mean?" This question calls explicitly for topic repair.)

The procedures summarized in (1) above and elaborated in the preceding paragraphs are referred to in Table 3 and hereafter as "the rules for claims." Table 3 documents that student utterances in accord with the rules for claims almost always get the floor during Year 1 and Year 2 organizing and teaching segments, while those which are not in accord with these rules do not.

(2) *a.* When the teacher has elicited information that any student could potentially have, speak up directly with a response to the elicitation.

b. When the teacher has elicited information from an individual student that only that student can have, remain silent and permit that student to respond.

Tables 4 and 5 summarize the types of information that Ms. Wright elicits during organizing and teaching speech activities, as well as the response procedures indicated in the phrasing of her elicitations.

Some of the information that she seeks is potentially available to any student in the class. Such information includes general, factual information ("What color are potatoes inside? Purple?"), curricular information ("What letter does *potato* start with?"), and information about classroom procedures ("For that, we use the paper in the [pause] what?"). Other elicitations require students to refer themselves, rather than to the external world, for responses. Ms. Wright usually calls for such "self-reference" information in order to find out what students know or remember, so that she can shape subsequent utterances to fit students' understandings, or in order to determine their preferences among activity options. An example of a question serving the former purpose is, "Remember when we made pinchpots last year? Some of you made pinchpots, didn't you?" An example of one serving the latter purpose is, "Do you want to use the blocks today, Laura?"

Most often, the teacher simply poses an elicitation to the class, implicitly inviting any and all students to reply directly. Much less frequently, she names an

individual student in eliciting, apparently nominating that student to reply. Rarely, and only in Year 2, she phrases her elicitation in a way interpretable as inviting students to bid and be recognized in order to reply. ("Who can tell me . . .?" "Which of you knows . . .?")

Tables 4B and 5B indicate the ways in which students appropriately get the floor in responding to Ms. Wright's elicitations in each school year. The data in these tables document the procedures summarized as rules 2a and 2b in the text above. Ms. Wright most often invites replies directly; and when she does so, students routinely respond directly, neither bidding nor waiting to be nominated. Further, as Table 4B indicates, Year 1 students respond directly even when the teacher has named an individual student in eliciting information that anyone could potentially have. In such instances, neither Ms. Wright nor the students act as if the naming "counts" as an elicitation, although neither the teacher's intonational patterns nor anything else in her behavior indicates otherwise. Everyone's behavior in these Year 1 cases suggests that Ms. Wright's naming of individuals is intended to function in some other way: to encourage the student named to pay attention, for example (Dorr-Bremme 1982: 202-203). Only when Ms. Wright elicits self-reference information and names an individual student are opportunities preserved for the named student to answer.

Taken together, Tables 5A and 5B indicate a number of departures from these procedures in Year 2. During Year 2, students do most often get the floor for elicitation responses by speaking up directly. Students named to give self-reference information are routinely given the opportunity to do so. However, in Year 2 Ms. Wright does sometimes nominate individuals in eliciting information that any student could potentially have, and when she does so both she and the students make sure the named individual has the opportunity to respond. In Year 2 Ms. Wright sometimes invites students to bid in order to reply to elicitations. In addition, students sometimes bid and are recognized to reply to them even when

the elicitation's phrasing does not appear to invite bids. These and other procedural variations from Year 1 to Year 2 will be discussed further on in relation to students' social identities.

Sharing. The ways that students get the floor for speaking turns during the speech activity *sharing* contrast with these. To get turns at sharing, students normally need to bid for it. Ms. Wright chooses among the bidders, who then take the floor to tell about "personal things" in a long turn or long series of turns with Ms. Wright.

In the five Year 1 circles studied closely, 15 students gain the floor and share personal experiences. In every case their turns result from bids in the form or raising a hand, calling the teacher's name, or doing both simultaneously. In the same five circles, 27 claims, or utterances in which students speak up directly, occur. None win sharing turns for students.

In the three Year 2 circles analyzed, 17 students obtain turns to share, 11 by bidding. Six others do so by simply speaking up directly when other students discontinue, sharing experiences related to those recounted by the last recognized bidder.

Generally, students initiate the discourse topics during sharing. Most who are recognized can speak about anything they want. This is invariably true in Year 1 and frequently true in Year 2. On some occasions in Year 2, however, Ms. Wright enjoins students to speak about things that are "special" or "important," and sometimes she introduces a topic that students must address in sharing. The and other Year 2 differences in sharing will discussed later as they relate to students' social identities.

Summary: Circle Exigencies And Discourse Procedures

The teacher and class face competing demands during the first circle each day. In organizing and teaching, the group needs to be prompt but also thorough. Circle must end in time for later events to be pursued through their logical points

of completion, for example, until work time projects or snack time foods are finished and "messes" cleaned up. Nevertheless, circle organizing and teaching cannot be done in a cursory manner. If procedures for subsequent activities are misunderstood, confusion will jeopardize their accomplishment.

Simultaneously, circle participation must be "friendly" and inclusive. Ms. Wright wants a chance to hear from as many class members as possible. Students have things they wish to share. Denying students opportunities to speak can engender frustration. "Cutting people off" once they have begun to speak is unfriendly. Neither alternative is concomitant with getting the day off to a good start. Nevertheless, unlimited talk by any one individual jeopardizes inclusiveness. Time for circle is finite. Even if all speak succinctly, including everyone who wishes to share can constrain the minutes available for essential organizing and teaching tasks.

The rules of circle discourse reflect and respond to these exigencies. The procedures most often in use can be glossed with the general principle: *Speak up directly when you have something to say, and do so in a way that moves circle work forward.*

Generally in classrooms, nominating individuals and recognizing bidders gives them sole right to the floor. If what nominees or recognized bidders have to say is inappropriate at the moment (or following elicitations, incorrect), the "friendly" option is to wait them out which costs time. The "unfriendly" option is to cut them off. Neither of these options is congruent with the exigencies participants face in first circle. However, the "speak up directly - move circle forward" principle circumvents these situationally undesirable alternatives. It allows the teacher to sort through students' utterances, acknowledging and responding to those that contribute to her topic at the moment, overlooking or briefly reprimanding others[6]. Little time need be spent searching for student speakers who can elaborate the teacher's informatives or respond to her

elicitations with correct information. Only when a student is called upon to provide information that only he or she can have does that student's turn need to be preserved.

Calling for bids during sharing, on the other hand, permits the teacher to distribute turns inclusively. (She routinely does so, never calling on the same student twice in any one circle's sharing segment.) Recognizing bids helps to clarify for everyone that the floor now belongs only to the individual recognized; that others who wish to speak must now wait. Little time need be spent straightening out whose turn it is or quieting competing claimants. As sharing unfolds, Ms. Wright is able to hear from different individuals one at a time, responding to whatever they wish to talk about. If students speak briefly, she can extend their turns with active listening response and questions. If they speak volubly, she can respond succinctly and recognize another bidder. As time seems to necessitate, she can end sharing simply by declining to recognize bidders. Time may preclude turns for all who want to share, but no one need be cut off. Moreover, many have chances to have their verbal contribution acknowledged each during circles organizing and teaching. Thus, the rules of circle discourse optimize the possibility of completing the event in a prompt and friendly manner.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF STUDENTS' SOCIAL IDENTITIES

Given first circle's rules and exigencies, certain dimensions of social identity are the focus of teacher attention in circle. Others remain in the background.

Circle is accomplished primarily through conversation. "Independence," "aggressiveness," and the "ability to follow through," as defined by Ms. Wright, are attributes that emerge when students are interacting in small groups, doing tasks and making choices, as in *work time* and certain afternoon lessons. They have little bearing upon circle. The other dimensions of classroom identity that concern Ms. Wright, however, are quite relevant in the context of circle.

For circle to be completed promptly, students must speak up in ways that move the circle work forward, rather than side-tracking and slowing it. This requires that students know what is going on, that they "listen and think" so that they do not need "special instructions or invitations." In Ms. Wright's terms, it requires maturity or "with-it-ness." It also requires producing factually correct responses to her elicitations: some degree of "academic advancement" or at least general knowledge.

For circle to be completed in a "friendly" fashion, as Ms. Wright defines it, students must speak out in ways such that the teacher can hear from many in the class but no one need be "cut off" or "put down." It requires, in other words, that individual class members be "talkative" or "expressive," although not so much so that they preclude turns at speaking for others.

Thus, the daily circle is one time during the school day when students, through their discourse, make available for the teacher just how talkative, mature, and knowledgeable they are. It is also one time during the day when children display through their talk attributes of reliable or unreliable leadership.

Ms. Wright gives evidence of noticing individual students' circle talk and of using it as a basis of forming impressions of them along these dimensions. These impressions of individual students' identities become situationally relevant to her first circle actions. Ms. Wright demonstrably takes students' talkativeness, maturity, reliability and knowledgeability into account as she interacts with them from moment to moment.

Tables 6 through 11 begin to support the claim that students do make these attributes available to Ms. Wright during circle. They show that the individual students who are salient to Ms. Wright in Years 1 and 2 routinely speak in ways consonant with her informal judgments of them.

Tables 6 through 11 focus on the students during each school year who were described earlier as salient to Ms. Wright. They also reflect the circle exigencies

and rules described in the last section. They list the frequency and proportion of students' circle utterances during organizing and teaching segments that function to: (1) move circle work directly along; (2) stall (deflect or slow) circle work; and (3) do neither of these things.

The first category includes only those types of utterances that (a) make a contribution to Ms. Wright's agenda at the moment *and* (b) do so directly and immediately, without slowing down circle work. Certain types of utterances that do move circle work forward have been relegated to other categories on the grounds that they slow circle work and inhibit its prompt completion.

Utterances that implicitly call for the repair of Ms. Wright's current discourse topic have been included them in the "stall circle" category for this reason. Utterances such as these do routinely win the floor in circle. They do contribute to circle work by calling the teacher's attention to the fact that everyone in the class does not share the knowledge presupposed in her current discourse topic. However, such utterances require repetition and elaboration of points that are in most instances understood by many members of the class. This is obvious when the teacher has made the point in question only seconds earlier and many students have affirmed their understanding of it with vocal listening responses and topic-collaborating remarks.

Further, I have assigned responses to elicitations for personal, self-reference information and utterances through which students volunteer for morning activities to the "other," category. Such utterances do move circle work along, but they are types of utterances that "anyone can make" whenever they are called for. The frequency of these utterances, therefore, has little bearing upon students' circle identities. (See footnotes to the tables for further information about the types of utterances included in each category.)

TALKATIVE, MATURE, YEAR 1 LEADERS

A review of Tables 6 and 8 reveals that the Year 1 students Rico, Dee, Elaine, Katie, Laurie, and Susan speak in ways that permit the teacher to locate in their talk qualities that she values: talkativeness, maturity, knowledgeability, and reliable leadership.

Individually and collectively, these six speak often. As a group they make 39 percent of the utterances in the five circles analyzed (Table 6). As Table 8 suggests, this exceeds the proportion of utterances made by the 15 other class members (excluding Billy, Daniel, and Alice) throughout the same five circles. Those 15 members make 196 utterances in all, or an average of about 13 per individual. All six "talkative" first grade leaders produce more than this average number. Their talkativeness is further indicated by the duration of their talk. While there is considerable variation in the duration of students' utterances during circle organizing and teaching, their mean length is about 2.5 seconds. Utterances of twice or more this length, i.e., of five seconds or greater, can be considered long student utterances. There are 43 long students utterances during organizing and teaching segments of the five circles analyzed. Collectively, the six Year 1 leaders produce 17 (39.5 percent) of these, with Rico contributing 3; Dee, 1; Elaine, 3; Katie, 7; Laurie, 2; and Susan, 1. Each of these students also participate frequently and volubly in sharing.

While Ms. Wright speaks of all six as generally "verbal" or "expressive," she also distinguishes among the talkativeness of the six in ways that reflect their performance in these instances of first circle. For example, she includes Rico and Dee among those who "very much exert themselves as far as calling out or speaking up." She identifies Elaine as not as "expressive or verbal" as the latter Rico and Dee but includes her among a group whose members "talk out, tend not to be shy or afraid." She perceives the less vocal Susan as "certainly not quiet; she is one of those "who speak out if they have something to say." Of Katie, the

teacher remarks at the end of Year 1: "Katie has become much more outgoing. It's very interesting. Katie started, she transferred from parochial school in the beginning of the year, St. Joseph's which is very, very structured, very, very tight. And Katie was very, very quiet. She's come way out of her shell now, really a different person. She held back in the beginning." None of Katie's 25 utterances occur in the first two circles studied; all come from those that were videotaped later in the school year.

Other ways in which these six students routinely speak make their maturity available to Ms. Wright. Of their 210 utterances in the five circles studied, 105 (50 percent) function to move circle work directly along, while only 44 of the 210 (21 percent) divert or delay the work of circle (Table 6). Table 8 indicates that this collective performance exceeds that of others in the class. Moreover, Dee, Elaine, Katie, Laurie, and Susan individually contribute to circle's prompt accomplishment far more often than to its delay. The same cannot be said of Rico, but Ms. Wright suggests that her impressions of him are unusually influenced by interactions with him beyond circle: "Rico's rambunctious and all but we really seem to just get along, and I think it's because, you know, when I get a minute during the day I really listen to Rico or I talk to him or he'll tell me or show me things. But I think I know him, really know him, because of that."

Students' academic advancement *per se*, as I have explained, is not of concern in circle, although students' general knowledge is displayed during the event. In this regard, it is worth noting that the six Year 1 leaders offer 53 factually correct responses to general or academic elicitations during the five circles studied and only 12 incorrect ones. (Their 53 correct responses are included among their 105 "move circle ahead" utterances in Table 6; their 12 incorrect ones are among the 44 listed there in the "stall circle" category.)

In all of the ways just described, Rico, Dee, Elaine, Katie, Laurie, and Susan display themselves as reliable leaders during circle. If others in the class do in

fact (as Ms. Wright puts it) "know who they are" and "follow their lead" in circle, those others will end up doing the right thing much more often than not. All in all, the circle discourse performances of all six of these students suggest that they are very much the "good, reliable kids" that their teacher describes them to be.

EXAMPLE 1

During reviewing morning activities, *Ms. Wright begins to tell the children about a work time activity she has planned: making papers flowers to decorate a May pole the class is planning to assemble.*

Ms. Wright: So, we're going to go to gym. And also-- [pause]. What did we talk about yesterday. What month is it today?

Dee: April.

Ms. Wright: It's April and it's --

Dee: The twenty ninth! [Laughs]

Ms. Wright [glancing at the calender]: You're right! It's April twenty ninth. I thought it was the twenty eighth.

Dee: Ri-ight!

Ms. Wright: It's April the twenty ninth. [pause] We have what tomorrow?

Several: Thirtieth.

Dee: Then the thirty first.

Ms. Wright [eyes on Dee, smiling]: We're going to surprise you.

Dee: Oh! No, it's not thirty first.

Ms. Wright: Remember we --

Dee: May first!

Ms. Wright: Right. Okay, wait a minute Dee, Some months've got thirty days and some have thirty one.

Dee: And some only have twenty eight.

The teacher noticed and commented upon these dimensions of the six Year 1 leaders on a number of different occasions while watch circle videotapes. The transcript labeled Example 1[7] describes the circle interaction displayed on the screen just before Ms. Wright observed, "That's Dee, the very smart one. Always on the ball, and you can see it right here: knows what's going on and really helps me out." Then pointing to the frozen frame on the video screen, she went on: "Actually, all of these --the big tall girl, Susan, and Katie over here, are one opposite extreme of this class. They're the most advanced. Rico in math, he's probably the top of the class. These three in reading. Very good kids, with Elaine and Laura. Very reliable. You know it in group time like this, like in the circle, they're the one's who take the lead and show the others, help things along."

The researcher prompted, "Show the others?"

"Well like Dee there, you know," Ms. Wright said, "Very with-it. Talking out, not shy, letting me know what the day was, and I guess I didn't, or wasn't quite aware, and she pointed it out for us."

Talkative, Immature Year 1 Students

In contrast to the six leaders, Billy, Daniel, and Alice speak during circles in ways that can be seen by Ms. Wright as "talkative" but also as immature. All three speak frequently in organizing and teaching (Table 7), notably more often the 15 other class members (excluding Rico, Dee, Elaine, Katie, Laurie, and Susan; Table 8). Bill and Daniel participated frequently in sharing. Nevertheless, when it comes to the important organizing and teaching the three frequently talk in ways that take first circle off track. This is true to a greater extent of Billy and Daniel, the two kindergarteners, than it is of first grader Alice. Comparison of Alice's speech performance in Table 7 and that of the "rest of the class" in Table 8, however, discloses that Alice's contribution to circle's prompt completion is

EXAMPLE 2

The class is engaged in distributing students to work time activities, *during which reading aloud the list naming the four students who have signed up to the use the big blocks has become routine.*

Ms. Wright [looking at the list]: All right, today is Katie, and Ronnie, and Rico, and Elaine's name are up for the, the blocks again.

Billy: You said . . .

Daniel: I wan' play with the blocks!

Billy: You said me 'n' Luigi could have a turn.

Alice [calling out]: Ms. Wright, I--

Ms. Wright [placing a finger to her lips and looking at Billy]: Shhhhhh! I said you could. Did you have your name put up there yesterday?

Billy: Yes.

Ms. Wright: Hmm? [Points to list.] Is your name up there?

Billy [sits silently.]

Student teacher [indicates Billy's name listed under another day.]

Ms. Wright: Well, when that day comes, when that day comes, then you can.

A minute and twenty seconds later as the distributing *segment continues, the following occurs:*

Ms. Wright: Okay, small block people, let's not have any trouble. Daniel, you're going to work with [the student teacher] on playdough today remember. [pause] Did you decide if you want to do that? [pause] Make up your mind.

Daniel: Yep.

Ms. Wright: You gonna make playdough, you're not gonna work with the [small] blocks.

Daniel: Yeah, then after the playdough, after the playdough, me 'n' Luigi wanna play with the blocks, all right?

Ms. Wright: We'll see how much time there is.

notably less than that of others in the Year 1 group. All three detract from circle work with statements and questions that are off topic and with elicitation responses that are incorrect. (They offer 20 of the latter; 12 present information which is factually wrong.) What is more, all of these students frequently display through their talk that they do not know what is going on at the moment and do not wise to classroom procedures. Of their 40 "stall circle" utterances (Table 7), 15 require Ms. Wright to repeat information she has just given or explain established class procedures which are at the time well-know to most in the class. (Of these 15 utterances, 5 are by Billy, 7 are by Daniel, and 3 are by Alice.) Each of these cases deflect circle interaction momentarily as Ms. Wright provides the "special instructions or invitations" that she sees immature children as needing. Ms. Wright's viewing session remarks following Example 2 are a case in point.

As the conversations in Example 2 ended Ms. Wright said:

> Billy just wasn't with us, or Daniel, here. It's been done over and over, but Billy's, he's just one of the most immature children in the class, and I think it was starting to come out there. I think that the others, you know, were with it, but he [Billy] still needs lots of individual instructions. And Daniel right there at the end, too. Very immature, very much so. You have to repeat and repeat, and, well, you just can't always stop and take the time. I, I didn't there with Daniel that last time.

TALKATIVE, 'UNRELIABLE' YEAR 2 STUDENTS

Year 2 students also speak in ways during circle that allow Ms. Wright to make informal judgments of who they are. In Year 2 the same dimensions of students' social identities are of concern to Ms. Wright. At the same time, however, the social identity of the class as a whole along these dimensions is different than in Year 1. The Year 2 class, according to the teacher, is generally much "quieter" with fewer "leaders," than the class in the previous year. Some of the "academically more capable children in this generally "more grade level" group were among the quietest.

Among members of this quiet class, four students stood out for Ms. Wright: Arthur, Louie, Louise, and Wanetta. Their most salient characteristic was their talkativeness: their tendency to "take over a lot of the conversations" and "just go off on tangents." She found the maturity of all four problematic, and she mentioned each of them, especially "leader" Arthur" and "organizer" Louie, as not being consistently "reliable."

These features of the four children's social identities are interpretable from the discourse performances summarized in Tables 9 and 11. Together, these four students, who comprise 20 percent of the Year 2 class of 20, produce 172 (45.6) percent of the 377 utterances in organizing and teaching segments of the three Year 2 circles studied. Fourteen other children in the class (excluding Kara and Nancy, discussed later) speak a total of 137 times in these same segments, for an average of about 10 utterances per student (Table 11). Thus, in the cases studied Arthur speaks over 8 times as frequently, Louie 4.5 times as frequently, and Wanetta and Louise about twice as frequently any of the other 14 on the average. Arthur, Louie, Wanetta, and Louise also talk at greater length than their classmates. Of the 14 long student utterances that occur during organizing and teaching in the three circles studied, the four talkative students collectively account for 12, or 86 percent of them. (Arthur presented 2; Louie, 6; Louise, 3; and Wanetta, 1.)

During first circle, too, these four display their problematic maturity and tendency to go off on tangents. Their statements and questions tend to stall circle work as often as they tend to move it forward (Table 9). Each of their circle discourse performances is in this respect far more "unreliable" than those of other class members. As Table 11 shows, their talk functions to move circle forward only about half as often as the talk of Kara and Louise or other students.

Arthur, Louise, Louie, and Wanetta frequently jeopardize the accomplishment of circle with the persistence of their talk. During one sharing

segment, for example, Arthur attempts to continue his sharing turn after another student has been recognized, "butts in" on teacher exchanges with two other students, calls out repeatedly in an effort to win a second sharing turn, and finally wins a second turn at sharing during which he holds the floor at great length. Wanetta frequently engages in similar behavior, as does Louie. Louise's persistence in attempting to secure the floor, as well as in holding it, is evident even more often than the others. Example 3 is a typical case, as the teacher's viewing-session commentary suggests.

EXAMPLE 3

As the class prepares to begin a project incubating eggs, Ms. Wright teaches about the fertilization of eggs. The following occurs over the course of 23 seconds mid-way through the teaching *segment:*

Ms. Wright: So there's special places that we have to go to by fertilized eggs. Hens can make eggs, lay eggs, they lay eggs every single day. But there might not be a rooster there. So--

Louise [loudly]: Oh! I know this --

Ms. Wright [placing a finger to her lips and looking at Louise]: Shh! So --

Louise: I know somethin',

Ms. Wright [leaning forward toward Louise]: Shhh! So we --

[Student messenger enters; Ms. Wright turns toward door]

Louise [without stopping]: uh, somethin' like that. In the far, far country, right? There's a [stops].

[*Ms. Wright* talks to messenger, turns back to the class, shakes head slowly "no" to Louise throughout the following.]

Louise [loudly]: I know a place, up in this far country, right? They sell eggs, right? They fresh from chickens an'--

Ms. Wright [rapidly, in low tones]: One minute. Please. It's my turn. Who said it first?

Louise: You.

Ms. Wright: All right then. Let me talk.

Viewing Louise in Example 3, Ms. Wright said:

> She constantly does that. She does it a lot, and you know she going to do it and that she's going to go on for a period of time. It's like Arthur, kind of, who you saw earlier. Arthur could take a clue from what I had said and is very well able to relate to something, but it's not totally appropriate. You know, he'll tie in, but get off on another tangent. But she's a big, a very large girl, and it's hard not to notice.

QUIET YEAR 2 STUDENTS

In contrast, quiet Year 2 students talk in very different ways during circle. Table 10 gives an overview of their discourse performance. Details of Kara's and Nancy's (Table 8) elaborate this general picture.

Kara and Nancy were first graders whom Ms. Wright noticed and spoke of somewhat more often than others in the class. She deemed them "capable academically" but also "very quiet." The two do speak relatively often in the three circles studied (Table 10), more than in other circles videotaped. Their remarks, however, are invariably brief. They offer none of the long student utterances during organizing and teaching in the three circles analyzed or in any others. They rarely volunteer to share. They say little when they do so. Nevertheless, Kara's and Nancy's maturity and knowledge come through in the circles analyzed. Approximately two thirds of their utterances during the organizing and teaching activities of three circles function to move circle ahead; relatively few (8.6 percent) stall circle's progress. Of those that serve in the former way, 23 (8 by Kara, 15 by Nancy) are correct responses to teacher elicitations. Only 3 of their answers to questions (all by Nancy) are incorrect.

As with many of the quiet children, these two rarely volunteer to share. They say little when they do so, as Example 4 below indicates. As the teacher watched this exchange with Kara, she gestured toward the screen and remarked:

"That's Kara, very capable, but very quiet. She's one of those that you have to go to them to use group time or sharing time."

Many times when Ms. Wright calls upon Kara, Nancy, or other quiet Year 2 children to speak during sharing, they have little or nothing to say. Example 5 illustrates such a case: when Carol, an "uncommunicative" Year 2 kindergartener fails to take a turn, the more talkative Wanetta steps in to take it for her.

EXAMPLE 4

Ms. Wright recognizes Kara during a sharing segment just after winter vacation. In a departure from usual procedure, she has asked the students to tell what they did during their week off.

Kara: Me 'n' Kelly made our own pizza at my house.

Ms. Wright: You made a pizza? Did you eat it?

Kara: Yeah.

Ms. Wright: Did it taste good?

Kara: [shrugs shoulders, smiling.]

Ms. Wright: Did you give it to anybody else to eat?

Kara: My whole family.

Ms. Wright: Ohh! Your whole family ate your pizza! How'd you make it?

Kara [softly]: With my, uh, with my mother, gave us, uh --

Ms. Wright: I can't hear you.

Kara [a bit louder]: My mother gave us a little help.

Ms. Wright: She gave you a little help. Well, what did you do? Did you -- Can you tell us how to make a pizza.

[Two seconds of silence]

Ms. Wright: What, what did you do first.

Kara [softly] We made the dough.

Ms. Wright: You gotta be faster, er louder, I mean louder.

EXAMPLE 5

Ms. Wright [to Carol]: You walked to school today so you wore your dress. You haven't told me why you have your coat still on, though.

Carol: Uhh--[Stops and sits silently, looking at the teacher.]

Nancy: "'Cause she doesn't want, she doesn't want to--

Ms. Wright: Sh. Can she tell me?

[Two seconds pass.]

Ms. Wright [smiling at Carol]: You can't tell me? [Pause.] Why is your coat on?

Wanetta: I can!

Carol [indicating Wanetta with a head movement]: Ask her.

Ms. Wright shifts her eyes to Wanetta, and Wanetta take the floor and explains why Carol is till wearing her coat.

SITUATIONAL SOCIAL IDENTITIES AND DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT

As students display these social identities, they have a significant bearing on the accomplishment of circle. The persistent but often immature or "unreliable" talkativeness of Arthur, Louise, Louie, and Wanetta makes it difficult for quieter students to obtain speaking turns. Ms. Wright has trouble hearing from many different students. Others such as Kara and Nancy, who help move circle forward when they speak, speak up only infrequently, leaving the floor to the four who often stall circle's progress. Ms. Wright takes these features of students' identities into account as she interacts with them in circle. Example 6 demonstrates a typical case in which she does so.

Remarking upon this exchange in a viewing session, Ms. Wright said, "That's Louie all over. He'll just comment on something out of the clear blue, and he can go on forever. The idea there was, the idea of "What's an imagination, Louie?" was

to, really I think, to steer him, 'cause you could tell he was going to say, er, talk then, whatever he was going to say. And, uh, didn't work though [laughter] "

EXAMPLE 6

Ms. Wright has been demonstrating how to cut and paste neatly in preparation for making a collage later on. Students have been talking about what the free-form, construction-paper shapes look like.

Ms. Wright [softly]: You're using your imaginations. You know what --

Louie: Ms. Wright, yo' know I think--

Ms. Wright [louder]: Louie, you know what an imagination is?

Louie: Well, that means you dream about things, like, uh--

Ms. Wright: It's like--

Louie: Like I dream about ghosts an' things but I think ghosts 'n' witches are real, because I, I go in my mother 's and father 's bed because I 'm scared at night--

Ms. Wright: Sometimes you can get scar--

Louie: 'an, an' that 's [pause] I get scared, that 's what I do. An I --

Ms. Wright [speaking quickly]: Sometimes you can have bad dreams, but you can also have nice dreams too that aren 't scary. Right.

In another Year 2 circle, Arthur waves his hand vigorously and calls Ms Wright's name as the class, engaged in *seeing who is absent*, tries to determine the number of absentees. Arthur's bid is eventually recognized. Watching this interaction in a viewing session, Ms. Wright stopped the the tape to say:

> Arthur was chosen there because I knew he could count and to help with control. . . . If they're there and they look like they want to say something, then I'll address them by name or call

> on them rather than letting them blurt something out. They're going to talk anyway one way or the other, so I'll just sort of sanction it a little bit sometimes.

Both cases above indicate that Ms. Wright is doing something more than responding to particular behaviors as they emerge. Instead, she is drawing upon her understandings of students' general classroom identities in interpreting "who" they are at the moment. Moreover, she is responding to Louie and Arthur in terms of these interpretations. In each case, she could "see" at a particular moment that Louie or Arthur was going to speak. "Knowing" that each is the type of student who "can go on forever" in a manner that "doesn't relate," she chooses to direct questions to each in order "steer" or "sanction" what they have to say.

In other situations, Ms. Wright takes students' identities into account in setting up circle conversations. That is, she uses her understandings of "who" students in the class are --and of how in view of their identities interaction is likely to unfold-- to anticipate and circumvent potential problems. Events during *reviewing morning activities* one day in Year 2 provide an excellent illustration of this.

At the outset of this *reviewing* segment, Ms. Wright explains that some "special people" will be called on to speak. Throughout the segment, she individually nominates or recognizes the bids of several "quieter" Year 2 class members. Meanwhile, Louie and Louise recurrently wave their hands in the air, occasionally calling out "Ms. Wright." The videotape of this scene had played for a half-minute or so when the teacher paused it to explain:

> The idea of special people was to direct it to the fact that everybody wasn't going to call out. . . . I had specifically settled everybody down and said you're going to listen at this point. And we're only going to direct it to certain people to speak, just so we can get it moving and get something out then go on to something else.[8]

A bit further on in the same *reviewing* discussion, several students have won turns by claiming the floor amidst Ms. Wright's individual nominations,

invitations to bid, and bid recognitions. Louise has spoken up directly to reply to an elicitation, but Ms. Wright has emphatically reprimanded her: "Louise! Louise! You're calling out." Watching this, Ms. Wright remarked:

> It's obvious that Louise takes over, that Louise has called out. She does it frequently. She will speak and call out, and it looks right there, it's almost unfair in a way. Other people have gotten a chance. But she's called out frequently since she's been here [in the month or two since school had started], and it was kind of a reprimand. Nipped her in the bud.

A few conversational turns later in the same episode, Laurie, a very quiet kindergartener, is nominated to answer a question. She sits silently until Ms. Wright has rephrased her elicitation twice. At this point in the viewing session, Ms. Wright volunteered:

> The other times I called on people here were specifically because they hadn't talked before. . . . You try to give her clues. But, uh, other times you look for people you haven't said anything for a long period of time, people who don't tend to be exuberant themselves.

The same challenges to the prompt, friendly completion illustrated in the organizing and teaching segments arise in Year 2 sharing. As quiet Year 2 students share reticently (e. g., Example 5 above), talkative Year 2 students often claim the floor from them. Taking account of this, Ms. Wright sometimes emphasizes that turns will be taken, often specifying a topic for subsequent students to address. An illustration appears in Example 7. Up to its end point, only the four persistently talkative and "unreliable" students have spoken. Louie and Louise describe television shows in turns of 25 and 23 seconds, respectively. Each of their turns is similar to talk that Ms. Wright described elsewhere as "rambling." Meanwhile, quiet students in the class sit by. It is in this context that the teacher emphasizes that "we're going to take turns" and formulates a topic for sharing.

EXAMPLE 7

The interaction below begins almost two minutes into sharing. Wanetta has opened the segment with a 20 second account of various things happening in her household. Arthur has held the floor for 30 seconds, focusing on some things he did while visiting his aunt. He is trying to continue as Ms. Wright recognizes Louie.

Arthur: Y'know what else?

Ms. Wright [making a "shh" gesture to Arthur]: What, Louie?

Louie: Ms. Wright, ummm, I watched [a tv show] where their ship landed on the planet and then, the motor went out. And I watched them another time when their ship-- [pause], and the motor went out again, and they were, ummm, the other guy, not, um, Junior, the other guy had wings all over 'im."

Ms. Wright: Okay, Louie. Let's just talk about things we can , er, all saw or we can all talk about. [Arthur is waving his hand.] Now Arthur you've had a turn. Louise, what?

Louise: On [another tv show], right, there was a welcome family an' there was this black leather. There was this guy, right? He was the robber, right? An' after that he came in the house 'n' robbed all the money, right? An' when he went outside he got shot, 'n' [pause] all [pause] 'n' all dirty, 'n' the rats came all over him.

Ms. Wright: Okay, All right. Wait a minute. That was interesting, but can we say one thing. I'd like to know if anybody did something during their vacation week that was unusual. I don't want to hear about tv shows. [Pause] I hope you did more then just watch tv, the whole week you were home. And we're going to take turns, if you have something that was special for you that you would like to share with us. But we don't want to hear about tv shows and just regular things that happen.

The data presented here demonstrate that students make their general classroom identities available to the teacher through their routine ways of speaking in circle. They also demonstrate that students' general classroom identities regularly become situationally relevant from moment to moment during the event. Ms. Wright takes into account "who" individual students are as she interacts with them. That she does is evident when she "nips" an attempted claim by Louise "in the bud." It is apparent when she nominates Arthur and Louie to answer questions, anticipating that they are about to speak anyway and that they may well speak about something irrelevant for a relatively long time. It is also

apparent as she involves quiet students such as Kara, Laurie, and Nancy in circle conversations by individually nominating them and by recognizing their bids.

Ms. Wright also considers "who" her students' collectively are as she chooses discourse strategies. This is obvious when she begins activities by emphasizing that "special people" will be asked to talk or that turns will be taken. It is manifest in her specification of sharing topics.

In contrast, the absence all these strategies in Year 1 provides evidence that the teacher is taking account of those students' social identities, too. The Year 1 class included the six talkative, mature leaders and other capable students who frequently spoke out. From moment to moment, someone in the Year 1 class was usually contributing talk that helped move circle forward. Thus, Ms. Wright could simply acknowledge those utterances and build her talk upon them, overlooking others who spoke up inappropriately. Of course, students in Year 1 sometimes spoke off topic or otherwise delayed completion of organizing and teaching work. Billy, Daniel, and Alice were talkative students who frequently did so. Bill, Daniel, and Alice, however, had to compete for the floor with 10 or 12 other students who were (in Ms. Wright's view) "willing to speak if they have something to say." Furthermore, none of these Year 1 students spoke recurrently, persistently, in a way that took discussions "off on tangents" and was hard to stop. Their talk often disclosed their immaturity: for hearing directions repeated or having "special instructions or invitations" given to them. But as Example 2 above shows, Ms. Wright could (albeit reluctantly) simply omit repetitions or special directions if circle threatened to run "too long." It should be clear, then that the absence in Year 1 of invitations to bid, of individual nominations, of instances of "cutting people off," and of the other strategies that Ms. Wright employed in Year 2 stands as evidence of her taking Year 1 students' identities into account in as she spoke with them in first circle.

DISCUSSION

Students' individual social identities in Ms. Wright's classroom are constructed interactionally in a complex process. In this process, individual students' discourse performances, the discourse performances of the entire group, the demands upon participants in circle, the discourse rules of circle, and Ms. Wright's interpretive schemes all interact.

Ms. Wright values particular aspects of academic and social performance in her students, and these lead her to perceive and interpret students' classroom identities along certain dimensions. The extant demands and rules of circle require a group of students who are, *collectively*, talkative, mature, reliable and knowledgeable within some limited range. At the same time, only when students collectively exhibit these dimensions of identity within a limited range do the extant exigencies and rules of circle become possible.

Students' talkativeness or expressiveness is clearly relevant to the accomplishment of circle. If no students were verbally forthcoming, Ms. Wright would have either to abandon her goal of hearing from many different students or initiate different interactional procedures to draw reticent students out. Time limits on the circle and the need for friendliness (in terms of not cutting speakers off) would not likely be salient concerns. If all endeavored constantly to speak, different rules for speaking would certainly be required. Procedures for regulating turns would be necessary during organizing and teaching activities in order for people to be heard. Without such procedures, striving for inclusiveness and friendliness --or, alternatively, the prompt completion of circle work-- would be futile. Terminating students' turns and/or overlooking many who wish to speak would become necessities. Clearly, then, the extant demands and rules of circle require a group of students who are, collectively, talkative within some limited range. At the same time, only within a limited range of "talkativeness" can the exigencies and rules of circle be maintained.

Students' maturity, as defined by Ms. Wright, is also germane to first circle's achievement. Students must be "with-it," in Ms. Wright's terms, in order to identify emergent circle speech activities and speak appropriately as they unfold. If all or most class members could not catch on to what everyone else was doing during organizing and teaching --if most or many required what Ms. Wright calls "individual instructions or invitations," students would consistently be speaking about things that had nothing to do with the activities or topics at hand. In such a case, once again, the extant rules of circle discourse would not be viable. Either friendliness and inclusiveness or promptness would need to be set aside as constraints. The same would also be true if all the "talkative" students were immature in the sense of not following and contributing to present activities. Thus, circle's exigencies and rules and students' maturity are interdependent. In the group as a whole, a certain number of children must be sufficiently mature for the construction of the rules and exigencies as they are; the extant rules and exigencies require a certain "mix" of maturity throughout the group.

The reliability of leaders or organizers is also a dimension of social identity that has relevance in the context of first circle. Whether leaders themselves are required for the accomplishment of the event is uncertain. If there are leaders in the class, however, their collective reliability matters. A prevalence of "unreliable" or "unpredictable" leadership would threaten circle's existing discourse procedures. Their persistence in doing "whatever it is they want" would make timely completion of the event, and/or its friendly conduct, unmanageable goals, especially to the extent that others followed their example. A balance of reliable leaders, by contrast, would function to support and sustain present discourse procedures and circle exigencies --procedures and exigencies which call for such leaders if leaders there be.

Academic advancement or capability is generally in the background during circle time. Nevertheless, the teacher does occasionally elicit bits of academic

and other information as circle unfolds. When class members can correctly reply to such elicitations, circle moves forward. When they cannot, Ms. Wright spends the time to inform or explain. Thus, the demand for promptness and existing elicitation procedures depend upon the presence in the class of some students who can respond with correct information, and the requirement for some number of such class members depends upon the existing elicitation procedures and the group's concern for promptness.

Further, as the nature of an event changes, so too do the dimensions of social identity which move to the foreground of interpretive attention (cf. Erickson & Shultz 1982: 15). If circle became very different, if perceived exigencies or interactional procedures altered, different dimensions of students' social identities might well become salient within it.

Extreme, hypothetical cases are mentioned here to underscore the interdependency of social identity and features of social content. None of these extreme cases obtain within the two school years studied. What occur is significant change in class members' social identities from Year 1 to Year 2. And with these changes in individual and class social identities come subtle but notable changes in circle procedures: procedural changes that respond to the social demands upon circle participants.

In Year 2 organizing and teaching speech activities but not in those a activities during Year 1, the teacher:

- Nominated individual students to respond to elicitations for general factual or academic information.
- Invited bids in eliciting such information and selected students to respond from among those who bid.
- Recognized bidders to respond to elicitations even when she had not invited bids.
- Recognized hand raising bids that students initiated in the absence of any teacher elicitation.

During sharing in Year 2 but not in Year 1 sharing, the teacher:

- Introduced topics of discourse and held students accountable for addressing them.
- Cooperated in students taking the floor for sharing turns by claiming it, i.e., without bidding or being nominated.

Ms. Wright engaged in all of these Year 2 interactional strategies as she took into account and interpreted individual's social identities and the class's identity as a whole. While the teacher did sometimes "cut off" loquacious Year 2 students (e.g., Louise in Example 3), employing these strategies reduced the frequency with which she had to do so. Rather than "all the time correcting" children or "putting them down" (as she put it), Ms. Wright could and did simply close the floor to them by calling on others. She also used the strategies listed above to steer the conversation toward less verbally forthcoming students in the group. In addition, if cutting off a student became in her view necessary, Ms. Wright could invoke announced procedures --"we're going to ask some special people", "we're going to take turns"-- as a rationale for doing so. (Citing "the rules" in this way can serve to soften or depersonalize a negative sanction. It can communicate, "I have nothing against you personally; I'm just upholding the rules.") Alternatively, when recognized students said little or simply stopped speaking during sharing (Example 6), "new" Year 2 sharing procedures permitted another willing speaker to take the floor and move things ahead.

All of these variations in year-to-ear circle procedures, then, were adaptations to students' social identities manifest in circle discourse. All of them functioned to facilitate circle's prompt completion in a friendly atmosphere. They helped maintain and achieve first circle's purpose of getting the school day off to a good start.

CONCLUSION

Most studies of discourse and social identity have focused upon dyadic encounters (e.g., Erickson & Shultz 1982; Gumperz 1982.) Most have described the impressions that conversationalists of different nationalities, ethnicities, or genders form of one another as they employ different rules of speaking and interpreting meaning. Thus, for example, Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982: 18) have pointed out that in ethnically mixed conversations differences in contextualization conventions, or ways of signaling what the social context is and when the context is changing, can lead to one conversational partner's inference that the other is "rude, irrelevant, boring, or making no sense at all."

Similar dynamics have been documented in studies of cross-cultural classroom interaction (e.g., Diaz, Mehan & Moll 1986; Erickson & Mohatt 1986; Heath 1986; Philips 1972, 1983). These studies, however, are not centrally concerned with individual students' social identities. Generally, they treat interaction as dyadic between teacher and class. They describe common features of individual students' discourse performances, rather than variations in them. In so doing, they note the same kinds of inter-group "miscommunications" mentioned above, for example, Native American students' ways of speaking leading white Anglo teachers to identify them as taciturn or stoical (Philips 1972, 1982).

Research of this kind tends to obscure important dynamics in the negotiation of situational social identities. Each party in the interaction is portrayed as knowing and using the interactional procedures, rules, or etiquette of his or her cultural or speech community. As each does so, situational social identities result. The researchers may acknowledge that the rules in use are socially constructed, but they rarely document this process since it is beyond the purview of their inquiry. Few examine exigencies of the speech situation as experienced by participants. Such studies, therefore, create the impression that context and rules are static, that the only salient features in the negotiation of

social identity are the ways the two participants act and interpret one another's actions in light of their respective rules systems.

This paper demonstrates the interdependence of social identity and many features of a constructed (and therefore malleable) social context. It suggests that all of the following are manipulated by participants as they construct and interpret others' situational social identities: the exigencies perceived by participants for and in the speech situation; the discourse performances of particular individuals and of the group as a whole; the procedures or rules in use in the speech situation; and the interpretive attention of participants (or, the dimensions of social identity that are situationally in the foreground for them.)

The interactional processes through which students classroom identities were generated in this one classroom, when juxtaposed to theoretical assertions regarding the negotiated nature o social identity, seem to be quite general. However, they have rarely been documents, and how general they are in classroom and other group situations deserves further investigation. In the meanwhile, it would be wise for teachers and others to make decisions based on their impressions of students only very circumspectly. Looking at students not only across social situations, but in light of the interpretations of different observers, may very well yield different impressions of who students are.

FOOTNOTES

[1] All names in this paper are pseudonyms.

[2] For discussion and evidence of the process of conjoint construction of discourse rules in first circle, see Dorr-Bremme (1982) and remarks by Cazden (1986: 439-440; 1988: 94).

[3] Thorough discussions can be found in Bremme & Erickson 1977; Dorr-Bremme 1982; and Dorr-Bremme 1990.

[4] "Accessible to the teacher" generally means audible to the teacher. The arrangement of microphones during videotaping allowed judgment of which student remarks were audible to the teacher with a reasonable degree of certainty, but these judgments were occasionally checked during viewing sessions with Ms. Wright. For other subtle criteria that figure in the concept of accessibility, see Dorr-Bremme (1982: 156-158).

[5] This and all other terms related to the discussion of topic are derived from and explicated in Keenan and Schieffelin (1976).

[6] Space precludes discussing when students' circle utterances receive reprimands from the teacher and when they are simply ignored. Reprimanding and ignoring, however, occurs in a systematic fashion as if rule-governed. See Dorr-Bremme (1982) for specifics.

[7] Prosodic markings, the exact points of overlap between and among participants' utterances, the lengths of pauses, and other details noted in the research transcripts have been omitted here for easier reading. None of them are relevant to this discussion.

[8] At the outset of this viewing session, I had told Ms. Wright that I was interested in "what's going on, what you're trying to do at particular points, and the children: your views of them."

REFERENCES

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind.* New York: Ballantine.

Birdwhistell, R. L. (1970). *Kinesics and context.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J. (1972). Social meaning of linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. -). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Bremme, D. W., & Erickson, F. (1977). Relationships among verbal and nonverbal classroom behaviors, *Theory Into Practice*, 16, 153-161.

Cazden, C. B. (1986). Classroom discourse. In In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 432-463). New York: Macmillan.

---------- (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cicourel, A. V.(1968). *The organization of juvenile justice.* New York: Wiley.

---------- (1974). *Cognitive sociology: Language and meaning in social interaction.* New York: Free Press.

Diaz, S., Moll, L., & Mehan, H. (1986). Sociocultural resources in institution: A context specific approach. In California State Department of Education Bilingual Education Office (Ed.), *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students*, pp. 185-226. Los Angeles: California State University Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.

Davis, K. (1949). *Human society.* New York: Macmillan.

Dorr-Bremme, D. W. (1982). Behaving and making sense: Creating social organization in the classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

---------- (1985). Ethnographic evaluation: A theory and method, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 7, 65-83.

---------- (1990). Contextualization cues in the classroom: Discourse regulation and social control functions, *Language in Society*, 19, 379-402.

Durkheim, E. (1896, 1938). *The rules of sociological method*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Erickson, F. (1976). One function of proxemic shifts in face-to-face interaction. In A. Kendon, R. Harris, & M. S. Key Eds.), *The organization of behavior in face-to-face interaction* (pp. 175-187). The Hague: Mouton.

---------- (1979). On standards of descriptive validity in studies of classroom activity (Institute for Research on Teaching Occasional Paper #16). East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University.

Erickson, F. & Mohatt, G. (1982). Cultural organization of participation structures in two classrooms of Indian students. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action*, pp. 133-170. New York: Holt, Rinehart

Erickson F., & Shultz, J. (1982). *The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews*. New York: Academic Press.

---------- (1981). When is a context? Some issues and methods in the analysis of social competence. In J. L. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), *Ethnography and language in educational settings* (pp. 147-160). Norwood, MA: Ablex.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.

---------- (1974). *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.

Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (1986). School effects. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 570-604). New York: Macmillan.

Goodenough, W. H. (1964) Cultural anthropology and linguistics. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology* (pp. 36-39). New York: Harper & Row.

---------- (1981). *Culture, language, and society* (2nd Ed.) Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin/Cummings.

Gumperz, J. J. (1972). The speech community. In P. P. Giglioli (Ed.), *Language and social context* (pp. 219-230). Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Education.

---------- (1976). Language, communication, and public negotiation. In P. R. Sanday (Ed.), *Anthropology and the public interest* (pp. 273-292). New York: Academic Press.

---------- (1977). Sociocultural knowledge in conversational inferences. In M. Saville-Troike (Ed.), *Linguistics and anthropology* (Georgetown University Roundtable on Language and Linguistics, 1977, pp. 191-211. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

---------- (Ed.). (1982). *Language and social identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1982). Introduction: Language and the communication of social identity. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, S. B. (1982). Questioning at home and at school: A comparative study. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action*, pp. 102-131. New York: Holt, Rinehart, .

Hymes, D. (1972). Introduction. In C. B. Cazden, D. Hymes, & V. John (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. xi-lvii). New York: Teachers college Press.

-------- (1982). What is ethnography? In P. Gilmore & A. A. Greenblatt (Eds.), *Children in and out of school* (pp. 21-32). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Keenan, E. O. & Schieffelin, B. B. (1976). Topic as a discourse notion. In C. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press.

---------- (1974) How behavior means. New York: Anchor.

Kendon, A. (1977) *Studies in the behavior of social interaction*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Linton, R. (1936). *The study of man*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

McDermott, R. P. (1976) Kids make sense: An ethnographic account of the interactional management of success and failure in one first-grade classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

--------- (1981). The language of role and the role of language, *Language in Society,*

--------- (1982). The structure of classroom events and their consequences for student performance. In P. Gilmore & A. A. Greenblatt (eds.), *Children in and out of school* (pp. 59-87). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Moerman, M. (1988) *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system.* New York: Free Press.

Parsons, T. ,& Shils, E. A. , (Eds.). (1951). *Toward a general theory of action.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Philips, S. U. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom." In C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of Language in the Classroom*, pp. 370-393. New York: Teachers College Press.

---------- (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs reservation.* New York: Longman.

Spradley, J. P. (1972). Introduction. In J. P. Spradley (ed.), *Culture and cognition: Rules, maps, and plans* (pp. 3-27). San Francisco: Chandler.

Scheflen, A. (1973). *Communicational structure: Analysis of a psychotherapy transaction.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Shultz, J., & Florio, S. (1979). Stop and freeze: The negotiation of social and physical space in a kindergarten-first grade classroom, *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 10,* 166-181.

Spradley, J. P. , McCurdy, D. (1974). *The cultural experience.*

Sudnow, D. (1965). Normal crimes: Sociological features of the penal code in a public defender office, *Social Problems, 12*

TABLE 1. *Examples of the sequencing of circle speech activities*

Year 1: December 10
Calendar / Teaching / TE / Reviewing / Distributing
1:41 5:24 5:56 11:55 12:22

Year 1: April 29
Greeting / I / Absent / Reviewing / I / Reviewing / Sharing / Distributing / I / Distributing
3:03 4:01 4:47 7:38 8:02 8:55 11:17 13:04 13:39 14:06

Year 2: February 23
Greeting / Absent / Reviewing / Sharing / Reviewing / Teaching / I / Teaching / Reviewing / Distributing
0:50 1:24 1:50 8:40 11:09 23:32 25:41 26:10 27:06 27:14

Year 2: June 18
Greeting / I / Greeting / Sharing / Reviewing / I / Reviewing / Teaching / Reviewing / Distributing
1:14 2:28 3:24 5:58 6:50 7:31 9:27 10:45 16:57 17:15

Note: I = interruption, "time out" > 10 seconds; TE = time unestablished, negotiated > 10 seconds. Numbers (e.g., 1:41) indicate approximate times of transitions from beginning of circle in minutes and seconds, omitting transitional interims of less than 10 seconds.

TABLE 2

ORGANIZING AND TEACHING SEGMENTS:
OBTAINING SPEAKING TURNS BY CLAIMS[1] AND BIDS[2]

YEAR 1

	TOTAL ATTEMPTED	OBTAIN TURNS	DO NOT OBTAIN TURNS
BIDS	119	0	119
CLAIMS	390	148	242

YEAR 2

	TOTAL ATTEMPTED	OBTAIN TURNS	DO NOT OBTAIN TURNS
BIDS	47	6	41
CLAIMS	322	156	166

[1] Claim = Student speaks without prior recognition or acknowledgment from teacher, asserting a claim to the floor.

[2] Bid = Student seeks the teacher's recognition for a turn at speaking by raising a hand or calling the teacher's name, bidding to be given the floor.

TABLE 3

ORGANIZING AND TEACHING SEGMENTS:
OBTAINING SPEAKING TURNS x FOLLOWING RULE FOR CLAIMS[1]

YEAR 1

Student speaker:	OBTAINS TURN	DOES NOT OBTAIN TURN	Total
FOLLOWS RULE	146	2	148
DOES NOT FOLLOW RULE	2	240	242
Total	148	242	390

YEAR 2

Student speaker:	OBTAINS TURN	DOES NOT OBTAIN TURN	Total
FOLLOWS RULE	149	5	154
DOES NOT FOLLOW RULE	7	161	168
Total	156	166	322

[1] Rules for Claims - In order to get the floor, student utterances must be: (a) accessible to the teacher and must (b) elaborate upon or call for the repair of the discourse topic that the teacher is currently addressing.

TABLE 4

YEAR 1 ORGANIZING AND TEACHING SEGMENTS:
OBTAINING SPEAKING TURNS FOLLOWING TEACHER ELICITATIONS

(A) TEACHER ELICITATIONS

Response Types Indicated:	Types of Information Elicited: GENERAL, ACADEMIC	CLASSROOM PROCEDURE	SELF-REFERENCE	Total
INVITATION TO REPLY	71	4	16	91
INDIVIDUAL NOMINATION	20	0	8	28
INVITATION TO BID	0	0	0	0
Total	91	4	24	119

(B) STUDENT RESPONSES

Response Types Accepted:	Types of Information Elicited: GENERAL, ACADEMIC	CLASSROOM PROCEDURE	SELF-REFERENCE	Total
DIRECT REPLY BY ANY STUDENT	91*	4	16	111
ONLY BY NOMINEE	0	0	8	8
INVITATION TO BID	0	0	0	0
Total	91	4	24	119

* Includes all 20 elicitations for general or academic information listed as individual nominations in (A).

TABLE 5

YEAR 2 ORGANIZING AND TEACHING SEGMENTS:
OBTAINING SPEAKING TURNS FOLLOWING TEACHER ELICITATIONS

(A) TEACHER ELICITATIONS

Response Types Indicated:	Types of Information Elicited: GENERAL, ACADEMIC	CLASSROOM PROCEDURE	SELF-REFERENCE	Total
INVITATION TO REPLY	43	1	16	60
INDIVIDUAL NOMINATION	11	0	4	15
INVITATION TO BID	1	0	0	1
Total	55	1	20	76

(B) STUDENT RESPONSES

Response Types Accepted:	Types of Information Elicited: GENERAL, ACADEMIC	CLASSROOM PROCEDURE	SELF-REFERENCE	Total
DIRECT REPLY BY ANY STUDENT	41	1	16	58
ONLY BY NOMINEE	11	0	4	15
INVITATION TO BID	3*	0	0	3
Total	55	1	20	76

* Includes two elicitations for general or academic information listed as initations to reply in (A), but in response to which students bid and are recognized.

TABLE 6
YEAR 1 STUDENTS SALIENT TO THE TEACHER:
FREQUENCY AND FUNCTIONS OF TALK IN FIVE CIRCLES ANALYZED

SIX TALKATIVE, MATURE LEADERS

	Number of Utterances [1]	Percent of Total [2]	Move Circle Forward [3]	Stall Circle [4]	Other [5]
Rico	64	12.0	18 (28.1)	26 (40.6)	20 (31.3)
Dee	51	9.5	38 (74.5)	6 (11.8)	7 (13.7)
Elaine	29	5.4	12 (41.4)	4 (13.8)	13 (44.8)
Katie	25	4.7	12 (48.0)	3 (12.0)	10 (40.0)
Laurie	23	4.3	13 (56.5)	2 (8.7)	8 (34.8)
Susan	18	3.4	12 (66.6)	3 (16.7)	3 (16.7)
TOTAL	210	39.3	105 (50.0)	44 (21.0)	61 (29.0)

1 = Total number of identified utterances by this student in the five circle analyzed..

2 = This student's utterances as percent of total utterances by all students in the five circles, excluding those made by unidentified students and choral responses.

3 = Number (percent) of this student's utterances that function to move work of first circle forward; includes (a) statements and questions which directly elaborate or explicitly call for repair of teacher's discourse topic and (b) correct responses to elicitations.

4 = Number (percent) of this student's utterances that function to stall or delay first circle; includes (a) statements and questions that do not pertain to the teacher's current discourse topic, (b) that call implicitly for the repair of the teacher's discourse topic by reflecting misunderstanding of information or procedures given, and (c) incorrect responses to elicitations.

5 = Number (percent) of this student's utterance which have minimal influence on the accomplishment of first circle work; includes (a) topic collaborating utterances; (b) verbal bids for recognition, (c) answers to self-relevant elicitations by nominated individuals, (d) greetings at beginning of circle, and (e) verbal volunteering.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 7
YEAR 1 STUDENTS SALIENT TO THE TEACHER:
FREQUENCY AND FUNCTIONS OF TALK IN FIVE CIRCLES ANALYZED

THREE TALKATIVE, IMMATURE STUDENTS

	Number of Utterances [1]	Percent of Total [2]	Move Circle Forward [3]	Stall Circle [4]	Other [5]
Billy	57	10.6	11 (19.3)	16 (28.1)	30 (52.6)
Daniel	39	7.2	8 (20.5)	16 (41.0)	15 (38.5)
Alice	33	6.2	10 (30.3)	8 (24.2)	15 (45.5)
TOTAL	129	24.1	29 (22.4)	40 (31.0)	60 (46.5)

1-5: See footnote explanations following Table 6

TABLE 8

FREQUENCY AND FUNCTIONS OF YEAR 1 STUDENTS' TALK : COMPARISON OF SALIENT GROUPS TO OTHERS IN THE CLASS
(FIVE CIRCLES ANALYZED)

	Number of Utterances [1]	Percent of Total [2]	Move Circle Forward [3]	Stall Circle [4]	Other [5]
Talkative, Mature Leaders (n=5)	210	39.3	105 (50.0)	44 (21.0)	61 (29.0)
Talkative Immature Students (n=3)	129	24.1	29 (22.4)	40 (31.0)	60 (46.5)
Rest of Class (n = 15)	196	36.6	92 (46.9)	44 (25.0)	60 (30.6)
TOTAL	535	100.	226 (42.4)	128 (24.0)	181 (33.8)

1 = Total number of identified utterances by this group in the five circle analyzed.

2 = This group's utterances as percent of total utterances by all students in the five circles, excluding those made by unidentified students and choral responses.

3 = Number (percent) of this group's utterances that function to move work of first circle forward; includes (a) statements and questions which directly elaborate or explicitly call for repair of teacher's discourse topic and (b) correct responses to elicitations.

4 = Number (percent) of this group's utterances that function to stall or delay first circle; includes (a) statements and questions that do not pertain to the teacher's current discourse topic, (b) that call implicitly for the repair of the teacher's discourse topic by reflecting misunderstanding of information or procedures given, and (c) incorrect responses to elicitations.

5 = Number (percent) of this group's utterance which have minimal influence on the accomplishment of first circle work; includes (a) topic collaborating utterances; (b) verbal bids for recognition, (c) answers to self-reference elicitations by nominated individuals, (d) greetings at beginning of circle, and (e) verbal volunteering.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 9

YEAR 2 STUDENTS SALIENT TO THE TEACHER:
FREQUENCY AND FUNCTIONS OF TALK IN THREE CIRCLES ANALYZED

FOUR TALKATIVE, UNRELIABLE STUDENTS

	Number of Utterances [1]	Percent of Total [2]	Move Circle Forward [3]	Stall Circle [4]	Other [5]
Arthur	82	21.8	24 (29.3)	18 (22.0)	40 (48.8)
Louie	45	11.9	11 (24.4)	19 (42.2)	15 (33.3)
Wanetta	26	6.9	6 (23.1)	8 (30.8)	12 (46.1)
Louise *	19	5.0	8 (42.1)	9 (47.4)	2 (10.5)
TOTAL	172	45.6	49 (28.5)	54 (31.4)	69 (40.1)

TABLE 10

YEAR 2 STUDENTS SALIENT TO THE TEACHER:
FREQUENCY AND FUNCTIONS OF TALK IN THREE CIRCLES ANALYZED

TWO QUIET, ACADEMICALLY CAPABLE STUDENTS

	Number of Utterances [1]	Percent of Total [2]	Move Circle Forward [3]	Stall Circle [4]	Other [5]
Kara	35	9.3	23 (65.7)	3 (8.6)	9 (25.7)
Nancy	33	8.8	20 (60.6)	4 (12.1)	9 (27.3)
TOTAL	68	18.0	43 (63.2)	7 (10.3)	18 (26.5)

1-5: See footnote explanations following Table 8.

* Reflects Louise's participation in only two of the three circle's studied. Louise transferred to the school after the first of the videotapes analyzed had been made.

TABLE 11

FREQUENCY AND FUNCTIONS OF YEAR 2 STUDENTS' TALK:
COMPARISON OF SALIENT GROUPS TO OTHERS IN THE CLASS
(THREE CIRCLES ANALYZED)

	Number of Utterances [1]	Percent of Total [2]	Move Circle Forward [3]	Stall Circle [4]	Other [5]
Quiet, Academically Capable (n=2)	68	18.0	43 (63.2)	7 (10.3)	18 (26.5)
Talkative, Unreliable (n=4)	172	45.6	49 (28.5)	54 (31.4)	69 (40.1)
Rest of Class (n = 14)	137	36.3	77 (56.2)	28 (20.4)	32 (23.4)
TOTAL	377	100.	169 (44.8)	89 (23.6)	119 (31.6)

1-5: See explanatory footnotes following Table 8.